



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/572,608	04/17/2006	Daniel Migault	33155.33	7650
7590 11/24/2009				
Gerald E Helget Briggs and Morgan Suite 2200 80 South Eight Street Minneapolis, MN 55402			EXAMINER KIM, EDWARD J	
			ART UNIT 2455	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/24/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/572,608

Applicant(s)

MIGAULT, DANIEL

Examiner

EDWARD J. KIM

Art Unit

2455

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 07/08/2009.
2. Claims 1-7 are pending in this office action. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to all pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bero (US Patent #6,769,031 B1), in view of Thuraisingham ("Security Constraint Processing in a Multilevel Secure Distributed Database Management System", April 1995, IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering VOL.7 NO.2).

Bero discloses, Dynamic DNS Information Updating (DDIU) system, wherein different levels of access restrictions are imposed on (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65).

Regarding claim 1, A telecommunications system comprising a reference server connected to at least one terminal by means of a communication network, said reference server further comprising a database comprising data associated with at least one domain name, and

said system comprising at least one first and one second auxiliary server containing data previously recorded within said database of said reference server wherein said first auxiliary server comprises confidential data associated to at least one owner of said at least one domain name and said secondary auxiliary server comprises public data associated to said at least one domain name and said one first and said one second auxiliary servers and respectively provided with first and second authorization access levels, said data in the first and second auxiliary servers previously recorded within said database of said reference server further comprising data issued from said reference server, and wherein said data issued from said reference server are spread over said first and second auxiliary servers relative to said first and second authorization access levels, at least one of the first and second auxiliary servers being provided with identification means for preventing any access to the data that it contains by terminals not having access authorisation compatible with the authorization access level attributed to the data contained in this auxiliary server.

Bero discloses, Dynamic DNS Information Updating (DDIU) system, wherein different levels of access restrictions are imposed on (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65). Furthermore, Bero discloses that there are confidential information related to domain names which should have restricted access, and there are public information related to domain names (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65).

Thuraisingham discloses a multi-level security measures in a distributed database management system, wherein different levels of security are imposed on different nodes (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Bero with those of

Turaisingham to distribute the data from the reference server into multiple nodes of databases, in a distributed database, wherein different level of authorization is imposed on depending on the needs. One would have been motivated to do so since Bero discloses at least two different levels of authorization for access to data (confidential and public) and Thuraisingham discloses distributed database systems wherein data are distributed among multiple nodes of databases. One would utilize a distributed database system for numerous reasons such as improvement in efficiency, response time, management of large amount of data, etc.

Regarding claim 2, Bero disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, and further discloses, comprised in that the database is provided with means of duplicating the data contained in the reference server to the first and second auxiliary servers according to the authorization access levels attributed to the said data (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65) (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274).

Regarding claim 3, Bero disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, and further discloses, comprised in that the first and second auxiliary servers are provided with identification means to prevent any access to the data contained in the first and second auxiliary servers by terminals not having access authorisations respectively compatible with the first and second authorization access levels (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65) (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274).

Regarding claim 4, Bero disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, and further discloses, comprised in that the reference server is provided with identification means for preventing of any reading of data contained in the said reference server from terminals not

having access authorisation compatible with a third authorization access level (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65) (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274).

Regarding claim 5, Bero disclosed the limitations as described in claim 4, and further discloses, comprised in that the third authorization access level has a restrictive effect greater than the restrictive effects produced by the first and second authorization access levels (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65) (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274).

Regarding claim 6, Bero disclosed the limitations as described in claim 1, and further discloses, comprised in that the reference server is provided with identification means for preventing any writing of data in the said reference server from a terminal not having access authorization compatible with an authorization access level having a restrictive effect greater than the restrictive effect produced by all the other authorization access levels attributed to the data contained in the reference server and the auxiliary servers (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65) (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274).

Regarding claim 7, Bero discloses a device for storing information comprising a reference server and at least a first and second auxiliary server containing data previously recorded within the reference server wherein said first auxiliary server comprises confidential data associated to at least one owner of said at least one domain name and said secondary auxiliary server comprises public data associated to said at least one domain name and said one first and said one second auxiliary_ servers respectively provided with a first and second authorization access level, said data in the first and second auxiliary servers previously recorded within said reference server further comprising data issued from said reference server, and wherein said data issued from said reference server are spread over said first and second

auxiliary servers relative to said first and second authorization access levels, at least one of the first and second auxiliary servers being provided with identification means for preventing any access to the data that they contain by applicants not having access authorization compatible with the authorization access level attributed to the data contained in this auxiliary server.

Bero discloses, Dynamic DNS Information Updating (DDIU) system, wherein different levels of access restrictions are imposed on (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65). Furthermore, Bero discloses that there are confidential information related to domain names which should have restricted access, and there are public information related to domain names (Bero, Abstract, col.7 ln.1-col.9 ln.65).

Thuraisingham discloses a multi-level security measures in a distributed database management system, wherein different levels of security are imposed on different nodes (Thuraisingham, Abstract, Introduction-pg.274). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Bero with those of Thuraisingham to distribute the data from the reference server into multiple nodes of databases, in a distributed database, wherein different level of authorization is imposed on depending on the needs. One would have been motivated to do so since Bero discloses at least two different levels of authorization for access to data (confidential and public) and Thuraisingham discloses distributed database systems wherein data are distributed among multiple nodes of databases. One would utilize a distributed database system for numerous reasons such as improvement in efficiency, response time, management of large amount of data, etc.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDWARD J. KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-3228. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30am - 5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Edward J Kim/
Examiner, Art Unit 2455
/saleh najjar/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455